

Serial No. 10/727,957
June 30, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 3, 2005
Page 4 of 8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 and 9 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants cancel claims 8 and 10-23.

Claims 6 and 7 have been withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected species. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin and allow claims 6 and 7 when generic claim 1 is allowed.

The drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to show the subject matter recited in claim 8. Applicants have canceled claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. As noted above, Applicants have canceled claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kojima (JP 7-263280). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima. Claims 1-5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (WO 03/001665) in view of Bodley et al. (US 2004/0000867). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of Kaneko et al. (U.S. 5,955,931). Claim 8 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. in view of Bodley et al., and further in view of Kaneko et al. Applicants have canceled claim 8. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-5 and 9.

Claim 1 recites:

“A noise filter comprising:

a laminate body including magnetic layers, line conductors, and ground conductors wherein one of the line conductors and the ground conductors is disposed in each of a plurality of interfaces between the magnetic layers such that one line conductor alternates with one ground conductor in lamination, with one ground conductor arranged on a top magnetic layer and another ground conductor arranged on a bottom

Serial No. 10/727,957
June 30, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 3, 2005
Page 5 of 8

magnetic layer, and the line conductors disposed between the magnetic layers being serially connected; wherein

the magnetic layer is made of a magnetic oxide and causes little or no attenuation of an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs and attenuates an electrical signal within a frequency range where the magnetic loss occurs." (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' claim 1, including the feature of "the magnetic layer is made of a magnetic oxide and causes little or no attenuation of an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs and attenuates an electrical signal within a frequency range where the magnetic loss occurs," Applicants have been able to provide a noise filter having excellent low-frequency passband characteristics, and that has sharply rising insertion loss characteristics and provides a large attenuation above a certain frequency (see, for example, the first full paragraph on page 3 of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that Kojima and Yamamoto et al. inherently teach the feature of "the magnetic layer is made of a magnetic oxide and causes little or no attenuation of an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs and attenuates an electrical signal within a frequency range where the magnetic loss occurs" because "such limitation is an inherent characteristic of a noise filter." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, conventional noise filters include magnetic materials which do in fact substantially attenuate an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs. As described in the Background of the Invention in the present application:

The known noise filter 100 has the following drawbacks. With the case 103 made of a magnetic material surrounding the metal line 101, the noise filter 100 functions as an impedance element with the metal line 101 having an inductance response to the permeability of the case 103. The noise filter 100, connected in series with a transmission line such as a

Serial No. 10/727,957
June 30, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 3, 2005
Page 6 of 8

printed circuit board, causes an impedance mismatch, thereby reflecting and thus controlling noise. The complex permeability $\mu' - j\mu''$ of the magnetic material forming the case 103 contributes to the Impedance of the noise filter 100. **Noise controlling is achieved in a frequency range where a magnetic loss μ'' does not occur.** In other words, since insertion loss occurs in a low-frequency range, low-frequency passband characteristics are adversely affected. (emphasis added)

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the feature of "the magnetic layer is made of a magnetic oxide and causes little or no attenuation of an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs and attenuates an electrical signal within a frequency range where the magnetic loss occurs" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 is not an inherent characteristic of a noise filter.

Neither Kojima nor Yamamoto et al. teaches or suggests anything about the specific magnetic material used in the noise filters or anything about attenuation (or lack thereof) in a frequency range at which magnetic loss does not occur.

In contrast, Kojima teaches an LC composite component including an inductor and a capacitor. This device attenuates the electrical signal in the frequency range where magnetic loss does not occur.

Yamamoto et al. defines the structure and the size of the filter in which the attenuation characteristics can be obtained from the relationship between the magnetic permeability and the internal size of the filter. Yamamoto neither teach nor suggests anything at all about frequency ranges at which magnetic loss occurs, and certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the magnetic layer is made of a magnetic oxide and causes little or no attenuation of an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs and attenuates an electrical signal within a frequency range where the magnetic loss occurs" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Bodley et al. and Kaneko et al. were relied upon to allegedly cure various deficiencies of Kojima and Yamamoto et al. However, neither Bodley et al. nor Kaneko et al. teaches or suggests the feature of "the magnetic layer is made of a magnetic

Serial No. 10/727,957
June 30, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 3, 2005
Page 7 of 8

oxide and causes little or no attenuation of an electrical signal within a frequency range below a frequency at which a magnetic loss occurs and attenuates an electrical signal within a frequency range where the magnetic loss occurs" as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Bodley et al. and Kaneko et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Kojima and Yamamoto et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kojima, Yamamoto et al., Bodley et al. and Kaneko et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicants' claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-5 and 9 depend upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In addition, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected claims 6 and 7 since these claims depend upon generic claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a One-month extension of time, extending to July 3, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated March 3, 2005.

Serial No. 10/727,957
June 30, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 3, 2005
Page 8 of 8

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2005



Christopher A. Bennett
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080